

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

**AMERANTH, INC.,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**MENUSOFT SYSTEMS CORP., ET AL.,**

**Defendants.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Civil Action No. 2:07-CV-271-CE**

**JURY DEMAND**

**DEFENDANTS' CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF ON**  
**"TRANSMITTING...TO A WEB PAGE"**

**I. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

The ordinary and customary meaning of a “web page” is “[a] document on the World Wide Web.” Ex. A, MICROSOFT® PRESS COMPUTER DICTIONARY 479 (4th ed. 1999). The intrinsic record, including both the prosecution history and the patent specifications, confirms the ordinary use of the term. Because Plaintiff (1) did not set forth a clear definition of a novel meaning of “web page,” and (2) propose a construction contrary to the intrinsic record, the ordinary and customary meaning controls. Thus, Plaintiff’s notion that a “web page” means a “web client,” or “browser” or some combination thereof is incorrect.

**II. THE CLAIM TERM “TRANSMITTING...TO A WEB PAGE” MEANS “TRANSMITTING...TO A DOCUMENT ON THE WORLD WIDE WEB.”**

Claims are generally given their ordinary and customary meaning. *Phillips v. AWH Corporation*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc). The ordinary and customary meaning of a “web page” at the time of the effective filing date of the applications of the Patents-in-Suit was “[a] document on the World Wide Web.” MICROSOFT® PRESS COMPUTER DICTIONARY 479 (4th ed. 1999) (Exhibit A).<sup>1</sup> Likewise, the ordinary and customary meaning of “World Wide Web” indicates documents on the World Wide Web are called “web pages.” *Id.* at 486.

The intrinsic evidence establishes that the Patents-in-Suit have used the term “web page” as “a document on the worldwide web.” For example, in response to an office action, Plaintiff argued that a prior art reference “describes the dynamic creation of menu *web pages* that are customized to a customer’s request.” Ex. B, 2/26/2001 Patent ‘850 Amendment at 6-7 (emphasis added). Under Plaintiff’s proposed construction, one of ordinary skill reading this response would be forced to reach the unreasonable conclusion that there is a “dynamic creation of menu

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendants seek the same construction of “web page” as requested in their summary judgment reply of Dkt. 165.

[devices that can receive and render a web page visible, e.g. a browser,] that are customized to a customer's request.”

Similarly, in the patent specification, Plaintiff defined the phrase “web” in accord with its ordinary meaning – the “world wide web.” (‘850 Patent at 2:8-19.) Thus, the phrase “world wide web” is an adjective that modifies the word page, which is simply a document. Thus, what must be transmitted to are documents on the “world wide web.” Furthermore, the patentee did not otherwise act as a lexicographer and “clearly set forth a definition” of “web page” in the specification. *See CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.*, 288 F.3d 1359, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

Finally, with respect to the claims themselves, the ordinary and customary meaning of “web page” is consistent with the “information entered on at least one web page” recited in claim 14 of the ‘850 Patent. (*Id.* at 16:32-36.) Thus, the ordinary and customary meaning of a “web page” controls. *See Kegel Co., Inc. v. AMF Bowling, Inc.*, 127 F.3d 1420, 1427 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (“Without an express intent to impart a novel meaning to a claim term, the term takes on its ordinary meaning.”).

### **III. UNLIKE A “WEB CLIENT” OR BROWSER, A “WEB PAGE” IS A DOCUMENT LOCATED AT THE SERVER END IN A TRADITIONAL CLIENT/SERVER ARCHITECTURE.**

Further demonstrating the Patents-in-Suit’s intention of an ordinary meaning for a “web page” is a description of the traditional client/server architecture<sup>2</sup> including “client computers”<sup>3</sup> on the client end and “Web server computers” on the server<sup>4</sup> end. (*Id.* at 12:21-29.) The Patents-in-Suit explain that the “software running on the user’s computer that enables the user to

---

<sup>2</sup> *See* Ex. A, MICROSOFT® PRESS COMPUTER DICTIONARY, at 88 (defining “client/server architecture”).

<sup>3</sup> The separate use of “client computer” and “web page” in the specification demonstrates the two phrases are not synonymous. (*See* 850 Patent at 12:21-33.)

<sup>4</sup> *See* Ex. A, MICROSOFT® PRESS COMPUTER DICTIONARY, at 403-04 (defining “server”).

view the HTML documents” is called a “browser.” (*Id.* at 12:29-33.) The Asserted Patents use of “client” and “browser” belies its argument that the Patents-in-Suit somehow defined a “web page” as a client, browser, or combination thereof.<sup>5</sup> That the Patents-in-Suit fail to enable the transmission of linked levels of information to a document on the world wide web does not suggest that the Court should adopt another meaning that preserves validity.

**IV. EVEN THOUGH THE ASSERTED PATENTS USE THE TERM “CLIENT AND BROWSER,” PLAINTIFF ATTEMPTS TO IMPERMISSIBLY REWRITE THE CLAIM TERM “WEB PAGE” AS A “CLIENT/BROWSER” COMBINATION.**

Plaintiff attempts to rewrite the “transmitting...to a Web page” claim language to mean transmitting “to a device that can receive and render a web page visible.” *See* Exhibit C, Shamos Expert Report at ¶97 (“Under the Court’s construction, element 1g requires software having the capability to transmit to both handheld devices and Web pages. I understand this phrasing to mean that the software must be able to send to a wireless handheld device and to a device that can receive and render a Web page visible, e.g. a browser.”). But, Plaintiff’s attempted rewrite is contrary to the Patents-in-Suit’s teaching that the client/browser combination receives “menus” from a web server – not application software. (‘850 Patent at 12:21-33.) This attempt to now rewrite the claims – “transmitting . . . to a web page” – would require application software that transmits to a web server, which then transmits HTML code to a client device that uses a browser to render a menu visible. This is because the *only* teaching of transmitting to a client/web browser combination is through a web server. (‘850 Patent at 12:21-51.) The Patents-in-Suit do not support this interpretation for the claimed “application software.”

---

<sup>5</sup> The term “web server” is not synonymous with “web page” as both terms are recited in claim 12 of the ‘850 Patent and claims 11-13 of the ‘325 Patent. (‘850 Patent at 16:1-22.)

V. **CONCLUSION**

For the above reasons, Defendants Menusoft Systems Corporation and Cash Register Sales & Service of Houston, Inc. respectfully request that this Court construe “transmitting...to a Web Page” to mean “transmitting...to a document on the World Wide Web.”

Dated: September 13, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Marc L. Delflache*

---

Marc L. Delflache  
Texas Bar No. 05725650  
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800  
Dallas, TX 75201-2784  
Telephone: (214) 855-8000  
Facsimile: (214) 855-8200  
Email: mdelflache@fulbright.com

OF COUNSEL:

Otis W. Carroll  
Texas Bar. No. 03895700  
IRELAND, CARROLL & KELLEY, PC  
6101 S. Broadway, Suite 500  
Tyler, TX 75703  
Telephone: (903) 561-1600  
Facsimile: (903) 581-1071  
Email: otiscarroll@icklaw.com

Richard S. Zembek  
Texas Bar No. 00797726  
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
Fulbright Tower  
1301 McKinney, Suite 5100  
Houston, TX 77010  
Telephone: (713) 651-5151  
Facsimile: (713) 541-5246  
Email: rzembek@fulbright.com

**Counsel for Defendants  
MENUSOFT SYSTEMS CORP. and  
CASH REGISTER SALES & SERVICE OF  
HOUSTON, INC.**

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.